

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-8, 12, 14, 17-24, and 27-38. Claims 2 and 25 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-24, and 26-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Landegem (US 5,265,091) in view of Siemens (DE 019757610A1) and Cardy et al. (US 6,041,109). Claims 2 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. The Applicant has amended the remaining claims to distinguish the claimed invention from Landegem, Siemens, and Cardy. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner pointed to Landegem, FIG. 1; col. 8, lines 1-25; and col. 1, lines 25-40 for showing a connection between a broadband ATM network and a narrowband network (local and metro network nodes) and an interworking entity. However, the Applicant contends that the function performed by Landegem is very different from that of the claimed invention. In particular, col. 1, lines 25-40 of Landegem describes an ATM network with a virtual overlay network formed by a plurality of permanently allocated virtual paths. Communications over the paths are controlled by connectionless servers, which are part of the overlay network. Landegem uses the overlay network to establish communications over the ATM network in a connectionless way, i.e., without a virtual path having to be established first.

Referring to Landegem, FIG. 1, the network nodes (NN1 through NN4) are ATM switches coupled by ATM transmission links. (Col. 4, lines 14-19). All communication to and from users is performed via a dedicated connectionless server. (Col. 3, lines 55-59). Landegem states that users CLTE2 and CLTE4 are able to communicate with each other directly via the switching network in a connection-oriented way, and are thus not users of the virtual overlay network. (Col. 3, lines 59-64). Thus, Landegem is

providing an overlay ATM network on top of an ATM network in order to establish connectionless communications. This is very different from the claimed invention.

Amended claim 1 recites a system for combining narrowband and broadband transport mechanisms in a communications network. The system comprises a narrowband telecommunications node that includes narrowband switching fabric and switching intelligence; a plurality of broadband nodes that each include broadband switching fabric, but have no switching intelligence; and an interworking entity operatively connected to the narrowband telecommunications node and the plurality of broadband nodes. The interworking entity receives data and call control instructions in a first format from the narrowband telecommunications node, maps the received data and call control instructions into a second format interpretable by the plurality of broadband nodes, and sends the mapped data and call control instructions to at least one broadband node of the plurality of broadband nodes. In this manner, the switching intelligence in the narrowband telecommunications node at least partially controls the plurality of broadband nodes through the interworking entity.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Landegem of a system in which narrowband switching intelligence provides call control instructions through an interworking entity to broadband nodes that lack switching intelligence themselves. Such a system is also not shown by Siemens or Cardy. The Examiner stated that Siemens shows narrowband-wideband interworking. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Siemens of the narrowband switching node controlling the broadband switching nodes in the ATM network. Therefore, the allowance of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-11, 27, 28, and 35 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 3-11, 27, 28, and 35 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 12 recites an arrangement that also includes an interworking entity operatively connected to a narrowband node and a broadband node. The interworking entity receives data and call control instructions in a first format from the narrowband node, maps the received data and call control instructions into a second

format interpretable by the broadband node, and sends the mapped data and call control instructions to the broadband node. As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, these features are not taught or suggested by Landegem, Siemens, and Cardy. Therefore, the allowance of amended claim 12 and dependent claims 13, 29, 30, and 36 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 14 recites a system in which the broadband node does not include call control functionality, and routing data from the narrowband node is mapped by an interworking entity into a packet-switched format that is implementable by the broadband node. As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, these features are not taught or suggested by Landegem, Siemens, and Cardy. Therefore, the allowance of amended claim 14 and dependent claims 15-21, 31, 32, and 37 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 22 recites a method for combining narrowband and broadband transport mechanisms in a communications network. The method includes the steps of sending a first communication path instruction from a narrowband node to an interworking entity; mapping the first communication path instruction to a second communication path instruction at the interworking entity; sending the second communication path instruction from the interworking entity to at least one broadband node in a broadband network, wherein the broadband node includes broadband switching fabric, but no switching intelligence; and establishing a communication path in the broadband network responsive to the second communication path instruction. Thus, as in the previous independent claims, the narrowband node controls the broadband nodes using the interworking entity to map communication path instructions. As noted above in the discussion of claim 1, these features are not taught or suggested by Landegem, Siemens, and Cardy. Therefore, the allowance of amended claim 22 and dependent claims 23, 24, 26, 33, 34, and 38 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 3-24, and 26-38.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Date: 11-3-2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com